



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/878,859	06/11/2001	Simon Lok	AP33285	2657

21003 7590 04/24/2006

BAKER & BOTTS  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
44TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

YIGDALL, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2192

DATE MAILED: 04/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No. 09/878,859	Applicant(s) LOK ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael J. Yigdoll	Art Unit 2192	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael J. Yigdoll. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Walter Egbert (Reg. No. 37,317). (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 20 April 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: U.S. Patent No. 6,286,003 (Muta).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

#### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

##### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

#### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed the nature of the invention and the proposed claim language. Discussed other potential amendments to the claims to distinguish over the references, with particular regard to the proposed limitation, "wherein at least a portion of each component of said user interface toolkit is syntactically identical to said corresponding component of said remote-capable user interface toolkit." Applicant plans to submit another proposal for further discussion prior to the next formal written reply, which the examiner awaits.

MY



TUAN DAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

US P

PTOL-413A (09-04)  
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031  
US D P R N F R**Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form**

Application No.: 09/878,859 First Named Applicant: Simon Lok  
 Examiner: Yigdall, Michael J Art Unit: 2192 Status of Application: After Final

**Tentative Participants:**

(1) Examiner Yigdall (2) Walter Egbert

(3) \_\_\_\_\_ (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Proposed Date of Interview: April 20, 2006 Proposed Time: 11:00 AM (AM/PM)

**Type of Interview Requested:**

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Issues To Be Discussed**

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) _____	<u>Cl. 1, 10</u>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
[x] Continuation Sheet Attached					

**Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:**

Proposed amendments to claim 1 on attached sheet

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_

**NOTE:** This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Walter M. Egbert  
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner/SPE Signature

WALTER M. EGBERT  
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

37,317

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Appl. No. : 09/878,859  
Applicants : Simon Lok et al.  
For : DISTRIBUTED COMPUTER SYSTEM USING A  
GRAPHICAL USER INTERFACE TOOLKIT

Proposed Amendments to the Claims

Claim 1 (Currently amended): A method for distributed processing through a server and a remote client wherein an application is executed entirely in the server, wherein the application is configured to interact with a user interface toolkit according to an application programming interface, and wherein the user interface toolkit has a ~~component~~ one or more components that ~~performs each perform~~ a function, the method comprising:

providing the user interface toolkit on the remote client comprising ~~a component~~ one or more components each comprising code to perform a function on the remote client, wherein each said component is related to user interaction, and to generate an event coupled to said component in response to user interaction with said component;

providing a remote-capable user interface toolkit on the server comprising ~~a one or more remote-capable component~~ components, each remote-capable component which is configured to interact with the application according to the application programming interface and comprising code to generate a message to the component on the remote client to perform the respective function on the remote client, wherein there is a one-to-one correspondence between each component of said user interface toolkit and each component of said remote-capable user interface toolkit and wherein at least a portion of each component of said user interface toolkit is syntactically identical to said corresponding component of said remote-capable user interface toolkit;

invoking the remote-capable user interface toolkit by the application to perform the function according to the application programming interface;

generating the message by the remote-capable component of the remote-capable user interface toolkit on the server in response to the invocation by the application, the message comprising a higher-level command to the user interface toolkit on the remote client to perform the function, such that the respective function is only performed at the remote client;

draft - not for entry MY 4/20/06

Appl. No. : 09/878,859  
Applicants : Simon Lok et al.  
For : DISTRIBUTED COMPUTER SYSTEM USING A  
GRAPHICAL USER INTERFACE TOOLKIT

communicating the message between the remote-capable user interface toolkit on the server and the user interface toolkit on the remote client; and

performing the function on the remote client by the component of the user interface toolkit in response to the message.

Claim 10 (Currently amended): A distributed computer system having at least one server and one remote client wherein the server executes the entire application on the server, wherein the application is configured to interact with a user interface toolkit according to an application programming interface, and wherein the user interface toolkit has ~~a component~~ one or more components that ~~performs~~ each perform a function, the distributed computer system comprising:

a user interface toolkit on the remote client having ~~a component~~ one or more components each comprising code to perform a function on the remote client, wherein said component is related to user interaction, and to generate an event coupled to said component in response to user interaction with said component;

a remote-capable user interface toolkit on the server having ~~a one or more remote-capable component~~ components, each remote-capable component which is configured to interact with the application according to the application programming interface, and comprising code to generate a message to the component on the remote client, the message comprising a higher-level command to perform the respective function on the remote client in response to an invocation of the function by the application, such that the respective function is only performed at the remote client, wherein there is a one-to-one correspondence between each component of said user interface toolkit and each component of said remote-capable user interface toolkit and wherein at least a portion of each component of said user interface toolkit is syntactically identical to said corresponding component of said remote-capable user interface toolkit;

a server configured to communicate the message between the remote-capable user interface toolkit on the server and the user interface toolkit on the remote client; and

Appl. No. : 09/878,859  
Applicants : Simon Lok et al.  
For : DISTRIBUTED COMPUTER SYSTEM USING A  
GRAPHICAL USER INTERFACE TOOLKIT

a remote client comprising a processor configured to perform the function by the component of the user interface toolkit in response to the message.



Appl. No. : 09/878,859  
Applicants : Simon Lok et al.  
For : DISTRIBUTED COMPUTER SYSTEM USING A  
GRAPHICAL USER INTERFACE TOOLKIT

### Remarks/Arguments

In response to the Office Action mailed December 30, 2005, Applicant submits this Proposed Amendment for discussion purposes. A complete listing of all pending claims is submitted herewith.

Claims 1-8 and 10-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Muta in view of Mittal.

Claim 1 as amended recites, in part, "providing the user interface toolkit on the remote client comprising one or more components each comprising code to perform a function on the remote client, wherein each said component is related to user interaction, and to generate an event coupled to said component in response to user interaction with said component; providing a remote-capable user interface toolkit on the server comprising one or more remote-capable components, each remote-capable component which is configured to interact with the application according to the application programming interface and comprising code to generate a message to the component on the remote client to perform the respective function on the remote client, wherein there is a one-to-one correspondence between each component of said user interface toolkit and each component of said remote-capable user interface toolkit and wherein at least a portion of each component of said user interface toolkit is syntactically identical to said corresponding component of said remote-capable user interface toolkit." Support for this amendment may be found throughout the specification, for example, paragraphs [0045] and [0051] of the specification.

Neither Muta nor Mittal, either alone or in combination, recite such a configuration. Accordingly, claim 1 is believed allowable. Claims 2-9, which depend from claim 1 are believed allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claim 10 is allowable for analogous reasons discussed above for claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 10 is not believed anticipated by Muta in view of Mittal. Claims 11-20 depend from claim 10 are allowable at least for the reasons discussed above for claim 10. It is requested that the rejection of claims 1-8 and 10-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Muta in view of Mittal be withdrawn.

Appl. No. : 09/878,859  
Applicants : Simon Lok et al.  
For : DISTRIBUTED COMPUTER SYSTEM USING A  
GRAPHICAL USER INTERFACE TOOLKIT

Claim 9 is rejected as being obvious over Muta in view of Cohen. Applicants' arguments in the Amendments dated April 29, 2004 and February 11, 2005 are preserved herein. Claim 9 depends from claims 1 and is believed allowable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1.